Vol. IV. NOV. and DEC., 1866. No. 3.

THE

THEOLOGICAL ECLECTIC,

A Repertory,

CHIEFLY OF FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

BI-MONTHLY.

NEW YORK:

MOORE, WILSTACH & BALDWIN, PUBLISHERS,

60 WALKER STREET, NEAR BROADWAY,

Cincinnati: 25 West Fourth Street.

Terms $3 a year. Postage Three Cents a Quarter, if paid in advance.

CONTENTS.

XIII.—CHURCH MUSIC AND SONG.*

BY DR. K. R. HAGENBACH, PROFESSOR IN BASLE.

The means by which the congregation gives united expression to its spirit of pure devotion, are Song and Prayer. The passage in James v: 13, would, however, signify that the two differed in their method of application; that Song signified the expression of the joyful, and Prayer of the sorrowful spirit. And this is deeply founded in psychological truth. Joy is the mother of song, and need is the feeling which teaches one to pray. But still there are songs of affliction, (lamentations), songs of penitence and mourning; and there are, on the other hand, joyful prayers, (praise and thanksgiving). This proves that the distinction is not an absolute one.

We cannot really disjoin song and prayer, since song commonly assumes the form of petition, and in the ancient Church the two were more commingled than now. It is hard to determine how the two stood related to each other in the apostolic times. 1 Cor. ii: 4, exhibits prayer in connection with prophecy. On the other hand, Col. iii: 16, mentions song with exhortation, without specific mention of prayer. It is also to be remembered that "the Lord's prayer," which was given to the disciples as a model, does not make its appearance in the worshiping assemblies of the first Christians. It belonged to the *disciplina arcani*. Whether the "*carmen dicere*" of Pliny's letter to Trajan is to be regarded as the singing of a hymn, or as the recitation of a formula of prayer, is an open question. The ancient song was, for the most part, in the form of a recitation.

It is a commonly established liturgical principle, that the song is to be sung either by the whole congregation, or by the choir, but not by single individuals. The chanting of the priest at the altar, which is found in the Romish, and also partly in the Lutheran Church, can only be considered theoretically as a form of recitation, and would not be practically permissible in the Reformed

* Translated from HAGENBACH, *Grundlinien der Liturgik und Homiletik*, by Prof. J. M. HOPPIN, Yale Theological Seminary.

Church. Solo parts, performed by single male or female singers, trench upon the rightful boundaries of religious culture. They belong to the sacred concert, to the oratorio, where they certainly can subserve some devotional purpose; yet in these the devotional element is but the secondary consideration, and the artistic the primary; in religious worship this is reversed.

The fundamental basis of Protestant ecclesiastical song, is the CHORAL.* The choral (*cantus plenus, plein chant*) was introduced as is well known, at the time of Gregory I., in the place of the alternating Ambrosian chant. While the Roman Catholic and Greek Churches are deprived of this mighty instrument of devotion, the Protestant Church rightly considers the choral as its liturgical palladium. Zelter, in a letter to Goethe, regards the German choral singing re-introduced by the Reformation, as an original form of worship, making the great distinction between Protestant and Catholic worship, by giving, as it did, opportunity to the whole congregation, in the true spirit of the Gospel, to offer praise to God in song.

Besides this uniform element of the Choral, special choirs, with their more artistic harmonies, compose that variable element which, particularly upon festival days, conduces to the elevation of religious worship. But even in ordinary public worship, to assist in the singing of the choral by the whole congregation, a stated choir, alternating with congregational singing, will be found to aid materially in the ennobling and animating of Church song. It would be well, in a perfected system of cultus, for the choir, at the opening of every religious service, to receive the congregation with a greeting of song. If this is not always practicable, it should at least be done on occasions of formal public worship. The selection of pieces to be sung by the choir, of tunes, etc., should not be left exclusively to the choir leader, but should be in harmony with the superintending will that presides over the whole cultus,—that is, of the minister himself. A judicious pruning, and keeping down of all "brilliancies," is needful throughout, when by such displays, the devotional spirit would be more injured than aided. Care should be taken to prevent the performance of fugue-pieces, when often much that is disjointed (unfug) is perpetrated; of those artistic counter-point musical

* A simple sacred tune, sung in unison by the congregation; in a word, congregational singing. Tr.

combinations, in which the congregation perceive only a senseless confusion of tones with which they become wearied; of those "song-serpents" which twist themselves out into endless convolutions. The worst is, when the personal character of such a choir stands in no organic relation to the congregation, and the singing is only a part performed from time to time by strangers, (especially unsuitable is that element which is drawn from the opera). Therefore the effort of a Church to gather to itself its own Church choir, is to be greatly commended. The real position of the Church choir is to be the leader of congregational singing. It should stimulate the congregation, by setting before it a good pattern. At the same time it serves to lend animation and variety to the singing, where choir and congregation sing alternately, (*alternis choris*). This compensates, in some measure, for the aversion of the Reformed Churches to antiphonal or responsive singing.

In Church-song, the text of the song that is sung, is to be considered as well as the melody. The two are mutually conditioned upon one another. It is not meant by this that every song should have its own melody or tune. It were far better if a number of hymns could be sung to one and the same tune. It is only by having a limited number of tunes, which are, however, the most suitable tunes, that some certainty in the singing can be secured. But it ought to be laid down as a principle, that only songs of *one and the same character* can be used with the same tune, and that the mere accidental similarity of metre should not be the only deciding test. One should not sing a hymn relating to the resurrection and ascension of the Lord, to a mournful, penitential melody,—nor a penitential hymn to a joyful tune commemorating the birth of Christ. It is too frequently the case that the text of some of our most beautiful hymns is set to secular melodies. In order, however, to secure that permanency in the cultus of which we have before spoken, the text, as well as the tune, should be familiar to the congregation; it should be an actual possession. The Church has this song-treasure in its hymn book, which for this reason should not be too full, neither too meagre. The hymn book, besides its liturgical use, should often truly serve as a school book, and as a book of family devotion, and it is from this circumstance, and in particular reference to this, that many comprehensive hymns, more fitted for committing to mem-

ory at school, or for devotional reading, than for singing, have been placed in our hymn books, thus increasing their bulk. For a long time it was thought necessary that a special hymn should be chosen for every conceivable topic in the province of doctrine and duty. In this way hymns upon the attributes of God, and upon particular duties, (such as industry and frugality), have originated. Whenever a want has occurred in the rubrics, a hymn must be made expressly to meet this want, which naturally turns out to be prosaic enough. Thus in a Basle hymn book of 1809, we find the hymn,—

> "To tend this body, and to nurse it,
> This is, O Maker, my behoof;"

And so in a Zurich hymn book:

> "Not gloomy and severe is he,
> A Christian who delights to be,
> Without servility is kind,
> Both earnest and of friendly mind;" etc.

But setting aside such misconceptions, one would feel tempted by the exceeding richness of our Church collections, (there are said to be about 11,000 hymns), to place in the hands of the congregation a large store of truly good hymns. But when one looks more closely at this hymnological wealth, he would be able to select but a small number proportionally of such hymns, that could be recommended for all circumstances as Church and congregational hymns, as spiritual songs for the people. Those that truly are such, however, need no recommendation; they have made their own way, and though there has not been up to the present time, a successful agreement made upon a common hymn book, neither for Germany, nor even for reformed Switzerland, yet the individual Churches have silently united upon a number of truly classic hymns, which will be found in all good hymn books, however diverse these compilations may be. Here is indeed an absolute uniformity not arbitrarily created, or at least one not controlled by outward influences. This unpremeditated agreement of good minds in a good thing, is all the more delightful, —a quasi inspiration in the true evangelical sense.

Among the hymns in the hymn book, some will present themselves as forming a class of permanent, and others as forming a

class of variable hymns. Among the first class we reckon the hymns used for public worship on Sundays, for festivals and communion seasons, which, after longer or shorter periods, always come round as the old familiar hymns, and those which were committed to memory in youth; among the variable, or changing hymns, are those more thoughtful ones adapted to sermons, among which some may be more firmly established in the use of a congregation than others, but after all their recurrence is not a regular thing, but is determined more by the theme of the sermon. While such a Sunday hymn as "Dearest Jesus, we are here," could be repeated twenty or thirty times a year without difficulty, indeed, as often as the season for celebrating the Lord's resurrection comes round, it *must* be sung in order to maintain the spirit of the day, it might happen that a hymn specially adapted to a sermon might come in use only once in two years. But those hymns which, year in and year out, are not sung, should be omitted from a new collection. The hymns of a permanent character should so live in the heart and mouth of the congregation, that no book is needed for them. Singing from a book has something disturbing in it, and to a looker on, something really offensive. This cannot be avoided in the case of the variable hymns, because it can hardly be expected that the whole hymn book will be committed to memory; yet, in the singing of standard hymns which live in the memory, and which are reduced to but few in number, the book, as is customary among "the United Brethren," should remain shut. Among this class we count the hymn before communion, "O, thou Lamb of God," and the closing hymn, "The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ." To sing other hymns than those contained in the hymn book, can only be allowed upon extraordinary occasions, as upon a jubilee, or a national festival. But the hymn, whatever it be, if it be sung by the congregation, should be set to a familiar Church tune. The custom of the free Churches who from time to time introduce new productions of living composers, is indeed otherwise. But this agrees with their out-spoken spirit of individualism. Extraordinary hymns of this character may also be sung in periods of transition, and perhaps be made entirely new to meet occasions or sentiments, for which the customary hymn book is no longer competent to supply fitting expression. Thus Schleiermacher, before the new Berlin hymn-book was ready, distributed single leaves at the Church door.

The text of the Church hymn can either be one proclaiming the Gospel salvation (objective), or may be the expression of an inward desire for it, the feeling which appropriates that salvation (subjective). The history of Church music shows us that the songs of the first class have yielded to those of the second. Most of the hymns of the Reformation period, have the character of proclaiming, or publishing the Gospel —("It is salvation come to us."—"Our God is a firm foundation"); while with Paul Gerhard, Schmolck, and others, hymns of a yearning character, of a character receptive of the Gospel, are introduced,—("How shall I receive thee?" "O wounded, bleeding head.") The hymns of Cramer, Lavater, Gellert, are full of the reflective character, or of individuality, as those of Novalis. Schleiermacher did the good Gellert injustice, when he conveyed the impression that he was too "sickly" to be a good poet. We may appeal here to experience. Compare my treatise upon "Gellert as a religious poet," and the beautiful essay upon Gellert, by Nitzsch. In both of these styles the hymn must flow from its inner agreement with the Word of God, without being bound to follow literally the words of the Bible. Hymns which stand in no inner relation to the Bible, which do not spring from it, which are not pervaded, or at least touched by its breath, do not belong to a Christian hymn book. But by this, it is not said, as I have hinted, that Bible words only should be sung. It was a misconception when Luther himself thought that the ten commandments and the apostles' creed should be made into song, although he had his precedents for this in the ancient Church, which placed the epic before the lyric. We have always declared ourselves opposed to putting the Psalms into rhyme. On the contrary, the Psalms themselves, which for a long period have reigned alone in the worship of the Reformed Church, form in truth, the type and standard of Church song. Sundry other poetical portions of the Bible, besides the Psalms, have also assumed a typical character, as the Song of Moses, (Exod. xv); Hannah's Song of Praise, (1 Sam., 2, 1 sqq.); the "Trisagion" of Isaiah, (chap. vi); the "Song of Praise of the Three in the fiery furnace;" from the new Testament, the Thanksgiving Song of Mary; (the so-called "Magnificat," Luke i, 46 seq.); and the Apocalyptic Doxologies, (Rev. iv, 1; v, 12, 13; vii, 10–12; xix, 1 sqq.).

But every poem of a Christian character is not, for that reason, a Church hymn. The apostolic Church recognized psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, (Eph. v, 19; Col. iii, 16). How these were related to one another, it is hard to determine, yet by Psalms, we are obliged to understand either the Old Testament Psalms, or Christian Psalms modeled after them; by Hymns, songs of praise; by Spiritual Songs, hymns of a more general character. Olshausen sees no distinction in these, but considers them as being only different terms for one and the same thing. But how these should be sung,—how they are related to the cultus,—and how they harmonize with the other elements, we know but little. Still we have many hymns belonging to Christian antiquity; but these could not be easily sung by the general congregation. If we critically regard the newer religious poetry, it cannot be denied that it affords us in manifold forms, with much dull rhyming, much that is good and excellent; still, not all that is excellent poetry is suitable to be sung. The pathetic, as in Klopstock,—(though we here refer to his odes, for his communion hymn, "Lord, thou would'st make us truly ready," and the well-known "To rise again, yea rise again," should certainly have place in our hymn books); the prosaic and sentimental-reflective, as in Gellert and Spitta, (of the last, we would commend the beautiful "Abide with him who for your sake," and also others, though the charming poem "There goes a silent angel," perhaps the pearl of the collection, could hardly belong to a congregational hymn-book),—poetry of this character, and also much that might be sung by a select and limited circle to the piano, would not therefore be suitable for the Church.

Many songs, for example, of the United Brethren, have a too intimate and familiar tone to be sung by the whole Church together. This is the case with that much-loved song, "We find ourselves all here together." The hymns of Novalis also express too much individuality of mind in contra-distinction from the mass. "When all shall be untrue, I will be true to thee;" or, "Let others still pursue the broad and lighted way." A great assembly of worshipers could hardly sing such a hymn. Let it be understood that the "I" does not shut a hymn out. The "I" has a collective character, as the "Thou" ("order thou the paths.") But when the "I" of the individual contrasts itself with the mass, then it is a special "I," separate from others, and thus does not unite itself with the song of the congregation.

In order to be adapted to the use of the Church, a hymn must not only be fitted for general singing, but for congregational singing in public worship. It must unite the truly poetical lyric flow with the easily comprehended popular expression that presents itself as a free production of the devotional feeling, and as such finds its own way to the mouth and heart of the congregation. The composing of good church hymns is a special "charisma." They cannot be made to order, as perhaps a sermon can. The best church hymns have not been written for the purpose of being used as church hymns, but they have come into use (as the volk-songs have,) without willing it. Many have thought that the best tunes have had the same origin. It has been often affirmed that a hymn is not fit for a church hymn, because it is subjective in its character. We would rather affirm the contrary. There is indeed a subjectivity which is in harmony with the spirit of a fallen Church, or one that has not yet become right in its own subjectivity; but this will produce no true church hymns, (*Goethe, Sallet*). The same is true, also, of a Christian subjectivity which, in its manifestations and modes of expression, does not take root in the people, but leans towards some particular school *e. g.* the romantic. But when, on the other hand, the personal peculiarities of the poet have their natural roots in the life of the Church, and that the Church of the people, and are not first studiously wrought into a popular tone, then the hymn which has gone through one's own heart, which bears the stamp of a subjective experience, really attains of itself the highest degree of objectivity. This is the case with Job and the Psalms, and thus the most genuine Church hymns have their own history, and their myths as well. Least vital of all are the purely objective hymns, that is, such as could only have been made to order for some external occasion, or those which fit some dogmatic or moral need,—in a word, doctrinal hymns.

From what has been said, it is manifest that the periods of the Church in which the pure consciousness of the members shows itself in an energetic, and therefore spiritually productive principle, are also the most fruitful for church song. It is therefore entirely right that the Protestant Church should prefer to build itself upon those old original hymns in which that consciousness was vigorously expressed. This preference for the old, however, should not degenerate into a liturgical narrowness which closes the ear in advance to any hymn of the more recent time. This is

the affectation of antiquity. To forbid modern hymns altogether, would signify that the Church of the present shows signs of poverty. This point, thank God, is not yet reached. So long as our ear is accustomed to the ancient tone, there is little fear that it will despise the new. Many suppose that that only which has an antique sound should be adopted by the Church. With this aversion to what is new in song, a dissatisfaction in regard to the modern tendency of theology may entirely coincide. Which of these tendencies, to the old or the new, is the most just, we do not pretend here to decide. But at all events, it would be asking too much, if we should be called upon to hold the old dogmatic terminology of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as the only indisputably authoritative one, because it is contained in the old hymns of the Church. On the other hand, the different tendencies of these days, which are not to be forcibly set aside, should be appreciated and harmonized, if we would not wish to draw the limits of Church orthodoxy too narrowly in the hymn book; only there should be no motley mixture through which an inner contradiction runs, which serves but to bewilder a congregation. It would contribute much more to the upbuilding of the Church, if the Church would, where it is possible, strive to listen through all the centuries of Christianity, to the voices that unite for the glory of *one* Lord over all. We do not say too much when we say, "where it is possible." Many of our Church hymns, such as the Ambrosian chant, (*Te Deum Laudamus*), the "Come Holy Spirit," (*Veni Creator Spiritus*), the "O Sacred Head, so wounded," (*Salve caput cruentatum*), the "In the midst of life we are" &c., (*Media in vita*), spring from the Middle ages, or reach yet further back into the first centuries. That they have been changed in form, and thus brought nearer to us, is no disparagement to them. The old tones are heard through them still.

The true harmony between the historic past and present finds its application in the ancient church hymns, as far as they may be employed in the cultus of the present. Undoubtedly the blessing which we anticipate from the use of these hymns would be lost, if we rob them of their antique character, and wish to make them in all respects the fit expressions of our own time. But we have also to guard ourselves, lest a pious deference for the old degenerate into a contemptuous disregard of the humanity of

to-day, from which we may hardly demand the preservation of an absolutely unchanged text, such as the antiquarian may rightly claim. This is illustrated in part by those dogmatical roughnesses which either transcend the word of Scripture, or, which is the same thing, bring in Scripture improperly, coarsely painting representations of the wrath of God, which must be quenched by Christ's blood; of the devil, who goes about as a "spectre of the night;" of the torments of those who "with the damned throng must fire and brimstone feed upon;" and other crudities of the same kind, which at all times would be a welcome prize to the enemies of religion. Apollinarian extravagances also, such as "O mighty want, God's self is dead," are to be avoided from the stand-point of a sound orthodoxy. In this category, likewise, come false ethical representations of this world being "a vale of tears," out of which one could not be soon enough taken,—while very few who sing the hymn, would be willing to be taken at their word. One might reply that the Church is not to accommodate itself to the frivolity of the world, and the effeminacy of the age, but on the contrary, to contend with them, —to address sin-reproving hymns to the conscience of the children of this world, and if he who sings, feels smitten through the opposition of his worldly heart to the contents of these Scriptural hymns, the blame of this painful feeling lies upon himself, and not upon the hymn; and this should be a warning and awakening voice to him that the flesh should no longer strive against the spirit. We fully agree to this, but only in so far as the spirit, which is thus condemned, is a frivolous and blamable one, which cannot stand before the earnestness of Christianity. To many a one, the hymn which he has sung with others, may, in this view, be a spur to his conscience. But how do the two things agree, where perchance it should be said in the sermon, that the world is no vale of tears, that is, only by reason of sin; that worldly enjoyments are not condemned in themselves,—it is only through the sinful disposition with which they are enjoyed,—and yet the hymn still stands in direct opposition to this? It is only these *exaggerated* statements which we wish to do away, for these always work evil; they lead either to stupid indifference, or fanaticism. These antique roughnesses are seen also in crudities of language, which can be better borne than dogmatical crudities. They must happen sometimes when the hymns cannot be changed without

injury. This occurs especially in the quantity of the syllables and the rhyme. In the hymn, "Wie schön leuchtet der Morgenstern," we must let even "leuchtet" go as an iambus. In like manner we leave untouched the rhyme "waffen" and "betroffen," (in the hymn "Ein feste Burg"), or "Stimme" and "Zinne," (in "Wachet auf"), or "Sieh hier bin ich Ehrenkönig," or "Kost" and "Lust," if we would not make too deep and vitally perilous invasion upon the structure of the hymn. But the congregation easily get wonted to such anomalies, and are glad to have them occur, to have consciously before them an *old* hymn which in this way proclaims its honorable antiquity. In this matter the school must prepare the way. There are pedantic school masters enough who, from their narow stand-point, set youth in opposition to these incorrect expressions of the hymn book. On the other hand, the hymns "*Valet* will ich der geben," "*Gloria* wird dir gesungen," would lose nothing by changing the Latin scraps into German words, although the alteration of the initial word is generally injurious, and causes confusion to one searching for the hymn. Finally, the *naive* also comes under the same category, inasmuch as some hymns may bear very well to be spoken privately, but would not do for public singing. A congregation of the present day could not in truth sing without some sense of the ludicrous:

"Ein Kindlein so löbelich
Ist uns geboren heute,
Von eine Jungfrau säuberlich
Zum Trost uns armen Leuten."

and, in like manner,—

"Das Oechslein und das Eselein,
Die loben Gott den Herren sein."

nor,—

"Dess klopf' ich in die Hände."

To offer this to a congregation to sing, is the same as if one should set up an old German painting, with all its simplicities, as an altar-piece. As far as concerns the teaching of the history of art,—and even for the connoisseur himself, it may be exceedingly profitable and delightful, but it is not so for the middle stratum of our citizen-classes, who are too well educated to receive uncon-

cernedly anything that is offered, and too little educated to reconcile the historical and psychological features of the case. Finally, we confess that taste changes, and that which is endured in one age, is insupportable in another, and vice versa.

There are also hymns which were made in direct reference to the weakness of some believers, and which should be treated with the greatest possible tenderness and indulgence. One may say indeed that the Church should draw the people to the inner and outer understanding of its cultus treasures, and not let itself down to these weak ones; but this can be done only to a certain extent. If Paul could choose rather to eat no meat than that the weakest brother should be offended, (1 Cor. viii, 13), so we also might rest satisfied with a meagre diet in liturgical matters, rather than tickle our palates with aesthetical words, which to another man destroy all enjoyment in the worship. We should not offer condiments but bread to the people. Alterations of hymns should be made in the spirit and sense of the evangelical church which is to be edified through these hymns. If one looks carefully through the history of hymn-books, he strikes upon many most unwarranted alterations. The present period is not the first that has sinned in this matter. Luther complained that his hymns were mutilated, and the old orthodox in their flattening style of interpretation, have here set the example to the rationalists and neologists. A chief hand at altering was the churchly orthodox Klopstock. In the various changes which have already taken place, it is exceedingly difficult to discover the original reading. But before one proceeds to change a hymn, it is at least necessary to assure oneself of the true original reading, not to hold to it inexorably, but to make it a basis to proceed upon. Schleiermacher has well shown in his letter to Ritschl, that the question has not regard to the rights of an author, but to the Church and its edification. When a felicitous change has already made its way into the living hymn-books in the hands of the people, this should be adhered to and not again altered. But when a change is absolutely needed, great care should be taken not to make use of a modern phrase, which forms too great a contrast to the ancient complexion of the hymn, like a new patch on an old cloak, or a flaming red tile upon an age-blackened roof! A fine knowledge of language, and even a special perception of the particular author and of his use of language is

required, in order to make judicious alterations. Sometimes a whole verse, or many verses must be given up as incurable. This can be done without hesitation inasmuch as at all events, most hymns are too long, and in the best of them there are some dull portions which could be removed without injuring the general impression. Where such a gap occurs, the junctions where the separated parts are brought together should be skillfully made. Therefore it is that the restoration of old hymns for the Church's use is as difficult, and even more difficult, than the restoration of old pictures. But any modern alteration of an old hymn in accordance with a dogmatical system that is at variance with the evangelical Church, and its fundamental intuitions, must be evidently unsuccessful. The rationalism of the previous century made it in this regard an unfortunate restorer. But it does not thereby follow that true orthodoxy is capable of making a happy restoration of the old, or correction of the new. Even the hymns of Gellert must be left as they are, lest they should be made worse by attempting to mend them in the spirit of a dogmatical restoration: e. g. "Virtue's path is hard at first" into "Faith's path," and so on. Here it should be enjoined that what is right for one is right for another. If you will have Gellert in the hymn-book, then leave him his "virtue" and whatever is connected with it. But if there is fear of Pelagian leaven let the hymn itself be given up.

In regard to the *musical* element in Church song, the question arises whether the choral should be sung in one or in four parts? We would rather treat this question as an open question, since theorists themselves are not agreed upon it. Thus one says "the unison (unisono) of voices is as unnatural as it is offensive;" another pronounces "the congregational singing in different parts as a false way, as an illusion." He calls to mind the fact that volk-song is eminently unisonal. He says, "In this unison, as the expression of perfect communion, lies the truly elevating and impelling power of congregational singing." The hymn of one part (with organ accompaniment) finds its devoted defenders, especially in Germany, while in Switzerland, particularly in the country, where there are no organs, they hold to the singing of four parts, as the opposite is considered to be an evidence of want of cultivation. Luther in opposition to Carlstadt, defended the practice of singing in four parts, and called the unisonal singing

"a donkey bray." The argument against congregational singing in four voices, is first the great difficulty of overcoming the imperfection in their musical training of the great masses who attend our churches. In relation to this Schöberlein has remarked with truth "that every one chimes in with those neighbors nearest to him who sing only in his own key, and that the impression of the various parts is entirely lost to him, and can be only truly appreciated by hearers standing aloof and not participating." But it is still further urged that they who cannot even maintain an accompanying part are condemned to silence, or to join in the melody. The first is of doubtful expedieney, since it is a part of religious edification for every one to join in the singing as well as he can; the last disturbs the harmony, if the four parts are sung at the same time; the uncultivated singer finds that he is not right, and goes unsteadily between the one voice and the four voices, while he might be able to join heartily and gladly in one voice. And it is indeed true, and it is a fact somewhat encouraging to such a one, that the song of all combined is less artistically rich. And then it is a matter worthy of consideration that the voices which belong together do not come together in the order of place, as musical conformity would demand. Men and women sit apart, in like manner soprano and alto, and tenor and bass are pell-mell; boy's voices also (where the young people no longer sit together) are heard separate in the midst of men's voices, here a soprano, there an alto. This disturbs indisputably the effect of the four-voiced song. We come back then to the expedient before mentioned, that the choir previously sing a four-voiced and artistic strophe, without the organ, then the following strophe to be sung unisonal, *with* the organ, by the whole congregation, in the way of alternate song.

Another question that arises is whether the song sung by the congregation should be accompanied by the organ or by any other instrument. Although in the Reformed Church, the organ was broken to pieces as a "papistical music-mill" and condemned to silence, yet by degress it gained the ascendancy. In the Greek Church the organ (notwithstanding its Grecian origin) never came into use; in the Latin Church the papal chapel has never admitted it to this day, and in the 16th century it had so many opposers, that even at the council of Trent its removal was proposed. Its preservation in the Roman Catholic Church is especially due to the intervention of the Emperor Ferdinand.

That the organ can work disturbance in Church music there can be no doubt. There is much and bitter complaining over the organist's misdemeanors. But there is improvement in this respect. Where the organ is played by a skillful and consecrated hand, it does its part undoubtedly in devotional edification; not only in that it sustains the song and furnishes the harmony where there is harmonious song, but also in the prelude, which we have reckoned among the elements of religious worship. The concluding voluntary may likewise form a fitting close to the service. It surely does so, if the organist, animated by the impression of the sermon, strikes upon the keys of his instrument and lets an accordant strain pour forth, as if it were out of the upper sanctuary, answering that to which the whole congregation had just given utterance in song. We cannot agree with Schleiermacher when he says that "the playing of the organ at the close of the service is properly no part of the worship but is a free-will offering; therefore organists often play marches." Bad enough when that happens! The concluding voluntary upon the organ is to be sure not properly a part of the cultus, as during its performance the worshiping assembly takes its departure; but as at the beginning of the service the organ awakens the devotional sentiment, so it accompanies the congregation when they leave the house of God, as with the divine benediction. In this respect it stands in even closer connection with the worship, than the ringing of church bells; and yet even this is not without liturgical significance. The people should not be *played* out of church, but be *led* out, as those who have resting upon them the blessing of the Lord. On the other hand those fatal interludes which Harms has fitly characterized, are rightly judged in the more modern view, to be out of place.

The organ among all instruments is the only purely ecclesiastical instrument. It dwells and is enthroned in the sanctuary, a Church within a Church! He who would hear must come to it; it does not go out into the crowded world. As to the use of other instruments in Church music, sometimes these, like the harmonium, may be employed in default of an organ. Formerly wind-instruments were employed in the place of the organ and even with it. Trumpets have still a high liturgical significance. They represent the *Ecclesia militans* and call up the terror of the judgment day (*tuba mirum spargens sonum*). But for all ordinary

public worship, they are too ceremonial and should be reserved for the high triumphal feasts of the Church. They have in the absence of the organ their suitable place in military public worship. But how far at the present day the former host of string-and-wind instruments should be employed, is a difficult question to answer. It certainly stands written (Ps. cl, 3 sqq.): "Praise him with the sound of the trumpet, praise him with the lute and harp, praise him with the timbrel and dance, praise him with stringed instruments and shawms, praise him with the clear cymbals, praise him with the resounding cymbals." This is according to De Wette's translation; in Luther's translation, *violins* are likewise included. Compare also 1 Sam. xviii, 6.

But however uniformly these instruments may be recognized and named, the Old Testament cannot here be immediately transferred to the Christian dispensation, otherwise the timbrel and dance would also be re-introduced (Exodus xv, 20). Our string and wind instruments serve, ordinarily, other purposes, which are far from those of an ecclesiastical character, and thus their appearance in the Church has something foreign to the genuine churchly feeling. Wycliffe in his day declared himself against a church music which tended more to dancing than devotion. In like manner the Reformers strongly pronounced their judgment. Zuingle was a great lover of music, and a skillful performer upon the instruments then in vogue, but he never employed them for church music. Among the "United Brethren," stringed instruments are admitted without hesitation into public worship. They can do it because they know no place where violins and bass-viols are seen in any other relations than those connected with the Church. From the mass of the people however, we cannot hope for much discriminating thought in this matter.

The Romish Church both tolerates and aims to produce a ravishing musical harmony at its religious solemnities; our devotional sentiment would be more disturbed than elevated by this. A mixed festival solemnity in which the civil and ecclesiastical elements meet (as jubilees and such occasions) might perhaps form an exception. Still less edification would we find in a solo than even in a musical performance with a full orchestra, say a solo upon the violin or flute, though executed in the severest style. We are pretty much confined to this, that as a general rule, so far as instrumental music is concerned, we have to be content with the

organ. And it may be added that true liturgical impression is destroyed by whatever is introduced into the sanctuary of a purely technical or artistic character, whether appealing to the eye or ear.

As regards the conduct or regulation of church music, it does not stand in the power of any individual leader, whether preacher or pastor, to introduce hymn-books, or to change and determine the order of church song. Yet though all are called upon to take part in this, the pastor can do very much for the elevation and improvement of church music; therefore the musical cultivation of our ministers is to be greatly recommended as well upon the theoretical as the practical side. Since it is a prevalent fashion for the preacher to make choice of the hymn and of the verses to be sung, this is a privilege which he should make use of with the greatest conscientiousness, as much often depends upon the choice of a good hymn as upon the choice of a good text. One should not put this off to the last moment when the sexton announces himself to take the hymn, but he should be prepared betimes, and some attention should also be paid to the selection of the tune. For this reason the minister should be himself perfectly at home in the hymn-book.

XIV.—THE MOSAIC DISPENSATION AS INTRODUCTORY TO CHRISTIANITY.*

What amount of religious knowledge was it within the power of the pious and sincere among the Jews under the ancient dispensation to attain? In what way were the great questions that lie at the basis of all real religion, the questions relating to the deliverance from guilt and moral impurity, capable of being answered so as to bring salvation to their souls as a blessing which they might personally enjoy? And what kind and degree of spiritual privilege was it possible for them to receive?

These are questions of profound interest in many respects, but they are also questions not very easily answered. If we would arrive at a satisfactory decision on the subject to which they relate, we must carefully avoid everything of the nature of a hasty and sweeping conclusion. A rash skepticism, and an indiscriminating dogmatism, must be equally shunned in our treatment of the subject. It is only by a comprehensive survey of all the evidence attainable, and a cautious induction from what is seen to be probable, that any well-grounded result can be reached by us in such a field of inquiry. It is necessary, also, that we should abstract as much as may be from the ideas we have gathered from the Christian Scriptures, lest we insensibly carry back thence to the Old Testament what does not belong to it, and by reading it in the light of later revelation, ascribe to those by whom that revelation was altogether unknown, a degree of illumination which they did not possess, and which it was not possible for them to possess. It is not easy, indeed, to make this abstraction, and perhaps it is vain to expect that it can be made perfectly. As Foster has justly remarked: "The mind has no power of imagination to place itself as in the predicament of suffering, or having suffered, an annihilation of its knowledge; it cannot feign itself in a process of putting out one bright, fixed truth within it, and

* Abridged from a review of Litton's Bampton Lecture in the *British Quarterly Review.*

The Theological Eclectic,

A REPERTORY CHIEFLY OF FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE,

VOL. IV. JULY, 1866, TO JULY, 1867.

MOORE, WILSTACH & BALDWIN, PUBLISHERS,

60 WALKER STREET, NEW YORK,

AND 25 WEST FOURTH STREET, CINCINNATI.

Each number contains an average of 100 large octavo pages, and is published on the first day of every other month, on fine paper, in the best style of typography.

TERMS—$3. per year, *strictly in advance.* Any person remitting $15, with the names of *five new subscribers for one year*, will have mailed to him a complete set of the back volumes. The back volumes will also be sent to any one remitting $25, and *ten new names as subscribers for one year.* For $40, the work will be sent to *twenty new subscribers for a year*, and at the same rate for any larger number.

Subscribers should give their Post Office address in full, Town, County and *State.* Those in the Eastern States may write to MOORE, WILSTACH & BALDWIN, 60 WALKER ST., NEW YORK, and those in the Western States may address the firm at CINCINNATI.

Persons desiring the back volumes of the *Eclectic*, (which have been published at $1.50 per year, and contain much of the choicest recent Theological Literature,) can have the three volumes sent to them for $4 received by the Publishers.